

However, it appears that the Examiner has found claims 6 and 10 allowable. Claims 11 to 13 depend from claim 10. Thus it is assumed that only claims 7 to 9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Volz in view of Puschnerat.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

#### Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

Claims 1 to 18 were rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Richards

Independent claims 1 and 14 each recite a first anilox inker and a second anilox inker.

The assertion on page 5 of the outstanding Office Action that an anilox inker is “necessary to provide an operative device” in Richards is incorrect. Richards discloses a fully operative device with a standard inker, and does not require an anilox inker at all.

Moreover, there is no motivation or teaching provided to alter the inker of Richards to an anilox inker. In fact, anilox inkers are special short inkers with different driving requirements than in Richards, and their use on the printing press of Richards is not at all obvious. The claims thus are patentably distinct from one another.

Withdrawal of the double patenting rejection is respectfully requested.

#### 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection

Claims 1 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Richards.

Independent claims 1 and 14 recite first and second anilox inkers. As discussed above with respect to obviousness-type double patenting, Richards does not show or disclose an anilox inker at all, and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

The outstanding office action even admits that “an anilox inker [is] not specifically shown in Richards.”

To support an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) each limitation of the claim must be shown in the prior art. As admitted by the office action itself, the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection is improper and should be withdrawn, which is hereby respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 102(b) Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 4, 14 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Volz.

Volz discloses an offset printing press having independently driven printing cylinders. Volz discloses neither a thrown-off printing cylinder nor anilox inkers. In fact, the inkers of Volz are conventional inkers with ductor rollers D, vibrator rollers HW and distribution rollers R. (See col. 6, lines 1 to 14 of Volz).

Claims 1 and 14 specifically recite a first anilox inker and a second anilox inker. Volz does not show or disclose a first anilox inker or a second anilox inker and thus the 102(b) anticipation rejection is improper.

Withdrawal of the rejection to independent claims 1 and 14 and dependent claims 2, 4 and 17 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 3, 5, 16 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Volz in view of Murray. Claims 6 to 13 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Volz in view of Puschnerat.

However, claims 6 and 10 to 13 appear to be allowable and clarification in the next office action of such allowability is respectfully requested.

With respect to these rejections, these claims all depend from independent claims 1 or 14 discussed above. It is respectfully submitted that none of the prior art references teaches or discloses modifying Volz to provide an anilox inker. Neither Murray nor Puschnerat discloses an anilox inker. Withdrawal of the rejections to dependent claims 3, 5 to 13, 15 and 16 is respectfully requested.

Claims 19 and 20

New claims 19 and 20 were submitted in the previous response but not addressed in the outstanding office action. An indication of allowance of these claims is respectfully requested as well.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance and applications respectfully request such action. Formal drawings are also submitted herewith.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 

William C. Gehris  
Reg. No. 38,156

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC  
485 Seventh Avenue, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10018  
(212) 736-1940